

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

ROBERT ALLEN BAUTISTA

Plaintiff,

v.

PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS LLP,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 3:24-cv-02593-D

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION
AND, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION [DKT. NO. 34]**

The Court has considered Defendant’s Motion for Clarification and, in the Alternative, for Extension of Time to file its Response to Plaintiff’s Motion Regarding the Formal Objection to Arbitrability and Request for Relief [Dkt. 34] (“Motion”). The Court is of the opinion that the Motion is well taken and should be granted.

It is hereby ORDERED that Defendant does not need to respond to the Motion. The Motion is denied as moot.

OR

It is hereby ORDERED that Defendant may have twenty-one (21) days from the issuance of this Order to file their responsive pleading to the Motion.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED.

SIGNED this ____ day of _____, 2025.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE